

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

DUNCAN J. McNEIL III,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 05-C-0698

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

---

Plaintiff Duncan J. McNeil III, who is proceeding pro se, lodged a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that his civil rights were violated. Plaintiff is currently incarcerated in the Spokane (Washington) County Jail.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1), a prisoner plaintiff is required to pay the statutory filing fee of \$250.00 for a federal lawsuit. If a prisoner does not have the money to pay the filing fee up front, he or she can request leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in order to pay the fee over time. To proceed with an action *in forma pauperis*, the prisoner must complete a petition and affidavit to proceed *in forma pauperis* and return it to the court with a certified copy of the prisoner's trust account statement showing transactions for the prior six months. The court then assesses and, when funds exist, collects from the plaintiff at the time the action is filed an initial partial filing fee of twenty percent of the average monthly deposits to or the average monthly balance in the prisoner's trust account for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of the complaint.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In no event will a prisoner be prohibited from bringing a civil action because he or she has no assets and no means by which to pay the initial partial filing fee. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(4).

In this case, the plaintiff has filed a certified copy of his prison trust account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of his complaint. He also filed the required affidavit of indigence. Further, he has been assessed and has paid an initial partial filing fee of \$0.05. Upon review of the trust account statement and affidavit, I am satisfied that plaintiff is unable to pay the statutory filing fee in this case. Leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* therefore will be granted.

Next, the court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1)-(2).

A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327.

A complaint, or portion thereof, should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted if it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of the claim or claims that would entitle him to relief. *Hishon v. King & Spalding*, 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984) (citing *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957)). In reviewing a complaint under this standard, the court must accept as true the allegations of the complaint in question, *Hosp. Bldg. Co. v. Trs. of Rex Hosp.*, 425 U.S. 738, 740 (1976), construe the pleading in the light most favorable to the plaintiff and resolve all doubts in the plaintiff's favor, *Jenkins v. McKeithen*, 395 U.S. 411, 421 (1969).

The court is obliged to give the plaintiff's pro se allegations, however inartfully pleaded, a liberal construction. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972).

To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege: (1) that he was deprived of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, and (2) that the deprivation was visited upon him by a person acting under color of state law. *Gomez v. Toledo*, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980).

Plaintiff has filed a "Verified Complaint," a "First Amended Verified Complaint," and an "Urgent Ex Parte Motion." All three are incomprehensible. What is worse, plaintiff appears to have created his complaint and amended complaint simply by writing "ED-WI" on photocopied form complaints naming various officers of the court and various federal agencies as defendants. Plaintiff provides no explanation whatsoever of what connection these individuals or agencies have to the injury he has supposedly suffered. Because plaintiff has failed to set forth cognizable constitutional or federal claims, the case will be dismissed.

**THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED** that plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's pending motions are otherwise **DENIED**.

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Supervisor of the Spokane County Jail or her designee shall collect from the plaintiff's prison trust account the \$249.95 balance of the filing fee by collecting monthly payments from the plaintiff's prison trust account in an amount equal to twenty percent of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's trust account and forwarding payments to the clerk of the court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10.00 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The payments shall be clearly identified by the case name and number assigned to this action.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this action is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A(b)(1) for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

**IT IS ORDERED** that the clerk of court document that this inmate has brought an action that was dismissed under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A(b)(1) for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

**IT IS ORDERED** that the clerk of court document that this inmate has incurred a "strike" under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the clerk of court enter judgment accordingly.

**I FURTHER CERTIFY** that any appeal from this matter would not be taken in good faith pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) unless the plaintiff offers bonafide arguments supporting his appeal.

Dated this 9th day of August, 2005.

s/ William C. Griesbach  
William C. Griesbach  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup>Plaintiff alleges that he is a "civil detainee" who has "committed no crime and has not been lawfully sentenced [sic] on a valid criminal conviction." (First Am. Compl. at 2.) However, 28 U.S.C. § 1915 includes within its definition of "prisoner" not only those who have been convicted of and sentenced for crimes, but also "any person incarcerated or detained in any facility who is accused of . . . violations of criminal law or the terms and conditions of parole, probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(h). Accused persons are, of course, presumed innocent until proven guilty.